

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
FEBRUARY 5, 2014**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:00 P.M., in the Board Room, Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo
- The meeting was called to order by Commissioner Cone, Chair, and the roll was called by the Secretary.

PRESENT: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Shafer, Feldman, Connor

ABSENT: Zuniga, Salas

- Chairman's Statement
- Citizens to be heard
- Announcements

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Case No. 2014-029 | 312 Pearl Pkwy |
| 2. Case No. 2014-030 | 15551 Nacogdoches |
| 3. Case No. 2014-031 | 552 Leigh |
| 4. Case No. 2014-028 | 618 E. Locust |
| 5. Case No. 2014-026 | 123 W. Magnolia |
| 6. Case No. 2014-025 | 7300 Jones Maltsberger |
| 7. Case No. 2014-024 | 126 W. Agarita |
| 8. Case No. 2014-037 | 1424 Montana |
| 9. Case No. 2014-035 | 306 Sherman |
| 10. Case No. 2014-036 | 420 N. Cherry |
| 11. Case No. 2014-033 | 241 W. Summit |
| 12. Case No. 2014-039 | 409 Gillespie |
| 13. Case No. 2014-045 | 2241 W. Woodlawn Ave. |
| 14. Case No. 2013-230 | 119 E. Craig Pl. |
| 15. Case No. 2013-392 | 1430 Napier |
| 16. Case No. 2014-015 | 319 N. Olive |
| 17. Case No. 2014-042 | 506 Devine |
| 18. Case No. 2013-369 | 323 Lavaca |
| 19. Case No. 2014-010 | 2019 W. Kings Hwy |
| 20. Case No. 2014-043 | 1115 S. St. Mary's St. |
| 21. Case No. 2012-316 | 311 E. Travis |
| 22. Case No. 2014-049 | 307 Carolina |
| 23. Case No. 2014-022 | 2809 Broadway |
| 24. Case No. 2014-044 | 115 Main Plaza |

Items 5, 8, 9, 10, 16, 20, 21, 22, and 24 were pulled from the Consent Agenda to be heard under Individual Consideration.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve the remaining cases on the Consent Agenda based staff recommendations.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Shafer, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

5. HDRC NO. 2014-026

Applicant: Rebecca & David Martinez, Jr.

Address: 123 W. Magnolia

Withdrawn per applicant.

8. HDRC NO. 2014-037

Applicant: Office of Historic Preservation

Address: 1424 Montana

The applicant is requesting a Finding of Historic Significance for the property at 1424 Montana, including both the main dwelling and accessory dwelling.

FINDINGS:

- a. A site visit was conducted by staff and the Designation and Demolition Committee on January 8, 2014. During that meeting, it was noted that both the main and accessory structure were some of the oldest in the area and worthy of landmark designation.
- b. The house at 1424 Montana was most likely built sometime before 1905. City directory information indicates that Jesus Vidal, Sr., and Jesus Vidal, Jr. occupied the home. By 1911 Jesus Sr. was living in the house with his wife Josephine. Their son, Jesus Vidal, Jr. lived nearby at 1426 Montana with his wife Rosie. In 1911 the occupation of Jesus Vidal, Sr. was listed as cemetery tender. 1424 Montana continued to be occupied by the Vidal family until at least 1951, when Mrs. Josephine Vidal, who was widowed by this point, is indicated as living at the address by herself. Jesus Vidal, Sr. had died in 1920 according to an obituary in the San Antonio Express from September 5 of that year. Their son Jesus Vidal, Jr. continued to live at 1426 until at least 1960.
- c. The structures are a rare surviving example of a Texas vernacular board and batten wood frame structure. The main house has the typical mirrored door and window configuration, steeply pitched side gable roof and attached front porch, features commonly seen in early structures in San Antonio. The house has a rear shed addition. Classified ads from the 1950s confirm that there were two houses on the lot by this time. The 1912 Sanborn does show a one story wood frame structure in the rear of the property.
- d. This property meets more than the three required criteria for landmark designation (cited above), as per UDC Section 35-607(b).
- e. The Office of Historic Preservation is the applicant for this request. The Code Enforcement Division intends to forward a recommendation for demolition of both structures to the Building Standards Board. A Finding of Historic Significance would be the first step in providing protection for the structures against demolition.

Staff recommends approval of a Finding of Historic Significance for both the main and accessory structures at 1424 Montana.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve a Finding of Historic Significance for both the main and accessory structures at 1424 Montana.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Shafer, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

9. HDRC NO. 2014-035

Applicant: Office of Historic Preservation

Address: 306 Sherman

The applicant is requesting a recommendation to the City's Building Standards Board (BSB) for the main structure at 306 Sherman in the Dignowity Hill Historic District.

FINDINGS:

- a. The home at 306 Sherman first appears on the 1896 Sanborn map. It was built in the Folk Victorian style with simplified detailing.
- b. The home at 306 Sherman is within the Dignowity Hill Historic District. This portion of Sherman forms part of the northern boundary of the Dignowity Hill Historic District. This block of Sherman contains four historic homes, including 306 Sherman, and three vacant lots.
- c. In the Dignowity Hill Historic District survey, this home was identified as contributing for its original design, detail and scale.
- d. The home at 306 Sherman has undergone some modifications such as application of non-original siding and demolition of most of the front porch. While it has also suffered fire damage, the structure appears to be salvageable overall. Its original configuration and window openings are still evident.
- e. Demolition of structures that are contributing to a historic district should always be a last resort. Demolition should only be considered in cases where a loss of significance has occurred due to excessive deterioration or where repairs to the structure are found to be infeasible, resulting in an unreasonable economic hardship as outlined in UDC Section 35-614. Staff does not find that the conditions of this property constitute a loss of significance or that the structure is beyond repair.

Staff recommends repairs to the home at 306 Sherman based on findings b-d.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to recommend to BSB repairs to the home at 306 Sherman based on findings a through d.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Shafer, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

10. HDRC NO. 2014-036

Applicant: Office of Historic Preservation

Address: 420 N. Cherry

The applicant is requesting a recommendation to the City's Building Standards Board (BSB) for the main structure and accessory structure at 420 N Cherry.

The City's Code Enforcement Division has determined that the one-story, wood frame residential structures at this address are deteriorated beyond repair and is recommending demolition of the main structure per Chapter 6-156, subsections 1, 2, 4, 8, 11, 12, 15, 17 & 18 and accessory structure per Chapter 6-156, subsections 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 11, 15, 17 & 18.

FINDINGS:

- a. The house (main structure) at 420 N Cherry first appears in historic aerial images circa 1955 but it may be older. The house features a bungalow form with Craftsman style detailing. The house is a contributing building to the Dignowity Hill Historic District.
- b. The house at 420 N Cherry features a steel casement window on the front façade, as well as two other openings that appear to have once housed casements. It is unclear whether this is a later alteration to the house, or if this particular house originally had casement windows. The house also features a number of one-over-one wood windows, a standing seam metal roof, exposed rafter ends and stucco siding.
- c. Interior damage to the house appears to have occurred as a result of an isolated fire and water damage. Overall, the structure appears to be in sound condition and the roof is relatively new (2005 permit on file).
- d. Demolition of structures that are contributing to a historic district should always be a last resort. Demolition should only be considered in cases where a loss of significance has occurred due to excessive deterioration or where repairs to the structure are found to be infeasible, resulting in an unreasonable economic hardship as outlined in UDC Section 35-614. Staff does not find that the conditions of the property convey a loss of significance or that the structure is beyond repair.
- e. The accessory building at this address was likely constructed circa 1955 and lacks significant architectural detail. The accessory building is not considered a contributing building to the district and is eligible for demolition.

Staff recommends repairs to the main structure at 420 Cherry based on findings b through d and demolition of the accessory building based on finding e.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Judson to recommend to BSB repairs to the main structure at 420 Cherry based on findings b through d and demolition of the accessory building based on finding e.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Shafer, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.**16. HDRC NO. 2014-015**

Applicant: City of San Antonio, Hector Reynosa

Address: 319 N. Olive

1. Relocate an existing house which is currently at 319 N. Olive to a lot at 1032 E. Crockett. Both of these properties are on the same city block.

2. Create a parking area on the 300 block of N. Olive, which will cover 301, 305, 309, 313, 315, 319, 323, 327 N. Olive. The proposed parking area is part of the Carver Community Cultural Center 2012 Bond Program Project. Six foot tall wrought iron fencing with masonry pillars is proposed to screen the area from the street. The west side of the 300 block of N. Olive contains only two houses: 305 and 319 N. Olive. The remaining parcels are vacant.

FINDINGS:

- a. Staff performed a site visit to the properties at 305 and 319 N. Olive on January 7, 2014. At that time, staff found that the home at 305 N. Olive has been modified and is not contributing to the Dignowity Hill Historic District. The home at 319 N. Olive is still considered a contributing property and should be salvaged and relocated. The historic integrity of this block of N. Olive is not intact. Only the homes at 305 and 319 face N. Olive. The remaining lots on the west side of the block are vacant. The homes on the east side of this block face cross streets, rather than facing N. Olive.

b. The home at 319 N. Olive is a contributing structure to the Dignowity Hill Historic District. Currently it is one of only two houses on the west side of this block of N. Olive.

c. Both 319 N. Olive and 1032 E. Crockett are on the same city block, within the Dignowity Hill Historic District and with the same zoning designation. While the lot at 319 N. Olive is deeper than the one at 1032 E. Crockett, the two lots are approximately the same width.

d. Currently, the lot at 1032 E. Crockett is vacant. While relocation of a historic house is tantamount to demolition, in this instance the potential loss is mitigated by the facts that the proposed relocation site is very close to the original site, that it is in the same historic district, and that it is currently vacant, thus not requiring any further demolition or modification to other structures.

e. According to the UDC Section 35-613.a.2, it is important to consider whether there are proposed replacement plans for a property that will be vacated if relocation of a structure is approved. In this case, replacement plans are being proposed for HDRC review and approval.

f. The parking area is proposed to be screened by a 6 foot tall wrought iron fence with masonry pillars. While the Historic Design Guidelines do not encourage the introduction of front yard fencing taller than 4 feet in a residential neighborhood, a 6 foot tall fence is allowed for a parking lot in the UDC Section 35-514.d. Similarly, due to the loss of integrity of the block—with very few remaining historic homes with frontage on N. Olive—staff finds that a taller fence will not have an adverse effect on nearby historic properties.

g. Consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, Section 7.B.i, parking areas should be screened by a landscape buffer, wall, or ornamental fence two to four feet high. Staff finds that adding a landscape buffer along the proposed fence will help soften the parking area's edge and further screen the parking area from view.

1. Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings a-e.

2. Staff recommends approval based on findings a, e and f, with the stipulation that landscaping be incorporated along the proposed fence based on finding g.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve of item 1 as submitted based on findings a through e. Approval of item 2 based on findings a, e and f, with the stipulation that landscaping be incorporated along the proposed fence based on finding g.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Shafer, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

20. HDRC NO. 2014-043

Applicant: Roberto Medrano

Address: 1115 S. St. Mary's St.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a small insulating box on the front façade of 1115 S. St Mary's in order to contain an exposed fire line and connections. The dimensions of the box will be 3' wide, 4' high and 1' deep. The box will be constructed at the base of the structure at the skirting and will consist of like materials (stucco and wood siding) in order to match the main structure.

FINDINGS:

a. The insulating box is required by SAFD in order to protect this structures fire line from freezing. The applicant has explored other options for its placement and has determined that this is the preferred location.

b. The box itself is minimal in design and placed towards a corner next to a concrete stair. The materials selected will help the box to blend with the façade of the main structure.

c. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 8.B.iv., new connections through foundations should be avoided on the primary facade when possible. However, staff finds that the proposed size, materials and location of the insulating box will not greatly impact the integrity of the main structure nor will it conceal any important architectural features.

Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings a through c.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Shafer and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve as submitted based on findings a through c.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Shafer, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

21. HDRC NO. 2012-316

Applicant: San Antonio Bike Share

Address: 311 E. Travis

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a B-cycle bike share kiosk, docks and bicycles at Travis Park, on the southeast corner of the park at the intersection of E. Travis and Jefferson Streets. The proposed B-cycle station will be placed on a new concrete surface (approximately 9'x26') and will be bolted. It will use solar power. The proposed station will contain one kiosk, 18 docks and 5 bases.

FINDINGS:

a. A B-cycle station on the southwest corner of Travis Park, at the intersection of E. Travis and Navarro Streets, was approved by the HDRC on January 16, 2013. The previously approved station location was to be installed on an existing concrete surface.

b. This request was heard by the HDRC on January 15, 2014. At that time, the Commission discussed the appropriateness of placing a B-cycle station within Travis Park and whether an alternative location nearby might be feasible instead. The HDRC chose to postpone this request to the next HDRC hearing.

c. The Design Review Committee reviewed this application on January 28, 2014. Members of the committee noted concern over the prominence of the proposed location due to the number of docks that will be installed and the elevated setting within the park. One member of the committee found that the prominence of the station is what will make it successful, allowing it to be seen by people getting off of buses and coming out of the nearby St. Anthony Hotel. The committee discussed whether alternative locations could be explored, suggesting placing the station at the St. Mark's parking lot across the street from the park or adjacent to the recently approved dog park within Travis Park to minimize the visual impact of the station on the park.

d. The proposed station, on the southeast corner of the park, requires the introduction of a new concrete surface. No major trenching will be required as the slab will be poured on an existing grassy area at the edge of the park.

e. The proposed station will improve accessibility within the urban core and will increase accessibility to Travis Park in particular, in conjunction with proposed park improvements.

Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings d and e.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Valenzuela to grant denial based on the inappropriateness of the location.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Connor

NAYS: Shafer, Feldman

THE MOTION CARRIED.

22. HDRC NO. 2014-049

Applicant: Adam Ochoa

Address: 307 Carolina

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Construct a rear addition to the home at 307 Carolina by creating a rear-facing gable with hipped side dormers and a rear balcony and first floor porch. The proposed addition will have horizontal wood siding and a standing seam metal roof the match the materials on the historic home.
2. Repair the front porch of the home. The existing decking is deteriorated. The applicant proposes to replace the porch floor with new pressure treated boards and paint them dark green. The existing columns and railings will be repaired and remain in place.
3. Expand an existing rear bathroom on the northeast corner of the home.

The applicant also plans to perform interior restoration, including repairing cracked walls, chimneys, and ceilings, painting, and restoring floors.

FINDINGS:

- a. A request to modify the roof form of the home at 307 Carolina to create a master suite in the attic space by creating cross gables was denied by the HDRC on December 18, 2013. This is a new request that responds to concerns raised by staff and the Design Review Committee regarding the extent to which the original proposal altered the historic form of the home.
- b. The home at 307 Carolina first appears on the 1912 Sanborn map. According to this map, the footprint of this home has not been substantially altered since that time, although the front porch may have been widened and there is a space at the back that may be an enclosed porch or a rear addition.
- c. This house has Folk Victorian influences in terms of its form with very simplified detailing.
- d. The proposed modifications to the roof form will maintain the primary appearance of the home from the street, consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, Section 1.A.i.
- e. According to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation numbers 2 and 10, modifications should not alter historic spatial relationships and should be done in such a way that, if removed in the future, the original form and integrity of the property would remain intact. The proposed modifications include an offset between the original form of the roof and the proposed rear gable to help distinguish the original from the new, consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, Section 1.A.iv.
- f. The proposed, hipped side dormers do not directly face the public right-of-way and will not be highly visible to passing pedestrians.
- g. The existing roof is standing seam metal, so maintaining the use of that material on the modified roof is appropriate and consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, Section 3.A.

h. The proposed rear facing balcony will not be highly visible from the public right-of-way and constructing a balcony in this location will have minimal impact on the structure and its appearance from the street.

i. Staff finds that while a modest rear balcony is not inappropriate, the design details should relate to the existing front porch in terms of materials, railing design, form, and placement. The proposed rear balcony incorporates a railing that relates to the front porch railing, but with open rafters and a contemporary glazing system. Staff finds that more traditional fenestration would be appropriate and in keeping with the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, Section 4.A.ii.

j. Staff finds that if the front porch is in need of replacement due to rot and termite damage as indicated, the new material should be wood with a similar dimension to what is currently there.

k. The existing space at the rear that is proposed to be expanded will result in only a minor addition, not highly visible from the public right-of-way.

l. Staff finds that some distinction should be made between the historic structure and the proposed rear bathroom addition, consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, Section 1.A.iv.

1. Staff recommends approval based on findings a and d-g with the stipulation that the rear balcony incorporate a fenestration pattern more in keeping with traditional precedents and the style of the home based on finding i.

2. Staff recommends approval with the stipulation that the new porch floor boards maintain a similar dimension to what is currently there based on finding j.

3. Staff recommends approval with the stipulation that some distinction be made between the historic and the new based on finding l.

The applicant agreed to the approved stipulations at the hearing on 2-5-14.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve with staff recommendations based on findings a through l.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Shafer, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

24. HDRC NO. 2014-044

Applicant: Main Plaza Conservancy, Jane Pauley-Flores

Address: 115 Main Plaza

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install and display a projected art installation in Main Plaza. Equipment requested to be installed in Main Plaza consists of two digital projectors mounted to an existing canopy structure, speaker mounted to an existing light pole, speaker mounted to a new 25-foot matching light pole and an electrical control box. Trenching between 6" and 12" will be necessary to install conduit between the new AV equipment and an existing electrical connection located within the plaza.

The art program itself consists of a 21-minute animation which will be projected onto the front facade of the San Fernando Cathedral. Accompanying music will be played through the speakers. Entitled "The Saga", the installation consists of audio and visual work by French artist Xavier de Richemont and will depict scenes related to local history. The applicant has obtained a ten-year contract for display of the work. As proposed, the program would run 4 nights a week (Wednesday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday) at 9pm, 10pm and 11pm, for a total of 4 hours a week.

FINDINGS:

a. The Main Plaza Conservancy presented a Master Plan for a Rotating Art Program to the HDRC on January 9, 2009. The plan was approved with the following stipulations (among others):

- i. That no permanent art installations be made
- ii. That all art is temporary for a period of at most three months; and
- iii. All artwork is to be approved by the HDRC

b. The current request was reviewed by the Public Art Board on January 27, 2014, consistent with the provisions of UDC Section 35-656. The Public Art Board recommends approval of the request and has provided a Letter of Authorization to that effect.

c. This proposal was presented to the Design Review Committee on January 28, 2014. The committee members present expressed support for the installation, noting that it was an exciting proposal. One commissioner was interested to see how the infrastructure requirements for the installation would physically impact the plaza. A site visit was requested in order to fully understand the physical impacts of the proposed installation.

d. A site visit was conducted by the Design Review Committee on January 30, 2014, to inspect the locations of the proposed infrastructure and equipment upgrades. Those present found that the overall improvements were sensitive to Main Plaza and would not have a significant visual impact.

e. In accordance with UDC Section 35-655(g), the HDRC has the responsibility of reviewing and approving public art to be placed within all local historic districts. Although there are no specific guidelines pertaining to the design of public art, the HDRC shall be guided in its recommendation by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and any applicable sections of the UDC.

f. According to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation number 10, improvements to a historic property will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired. While the requested art installation will have a temporary visual effect on the San Fernando Cathedral, Main Plaza and its environment, the proposal does not require any major permanent alterations that would adversely affect any historic structures or properties.

g. The applicant has coordinated with the Archdiocese of San Antonio regarding the content of the art installation and intends to provide a letter of support from the Archbishop.

h. Proposed trenching for the installation of conduit was initially reviewed by the City Archeologist. The excavation is not expected to impact any sensitive or undisturbed areas of Main Plaza. The Texas Historical Commission has concurred that there are no anticipated adverse affects to archaeological resources due to this area being highly disturbed by previous construction activities.

i. The applicant will be required to coordinate with the City Arborist regarding trenching near any existing root zones in Main Plaza. A tree protection plan may be required.

j. The temporary nature of all art installations should be considered by the HDRC. The approved 2009 Art Plan defines temporary as a period of 3 months. Although the requested installation exceeds this timeframe, a longer period may be acceptable in consideration of the frequency of the showings. A schedule for the display of the installation has been submitted by the applicant. The applicant has also indicated that the schedule is indefinite and may be changed in the future. There is concern that prolonged display of the installation would inhibit how the cathedral could be viewed in its normal state. Any expansion to the proposed schedule should be approved by the HDRC in order to ensure that the installation does not become a permanent fixture within the plaza.

Staff recommends approval of the art installation, physical improvements and proposed schedule based on findings a through i with the stipulation that any expansion to the proposed schedule be presented to the HDRC for approval based on finding j.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve based on findings a through I with the stipulation than any expansion to the proposed schedule be presented to the HDRC for approval based on finding j.

AYES: Cone, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Feldman, Connor
NAYS: Judson, Shafer

THE MOTION CARRIED.

25. HDRC NO. 2014-017

Applicant: Lyndsay Thorn

Address: 438 E. Rosewood

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Construct a new pavilion in the rear yard, adjacent to the existing pool and in front of the existing garage. The proposed structure will mimic the design of the house with a clay barrel tile roof and arched openings. It will connect to the north façade of the existing garage which is currently a solid wall with one door on its western end. The proposed connector piece will be approximately 1' lower in height than the existing tiled parapet of the garage and it will step up to 14' in overall height adjacent to the pool.

2. Construct a new fence along the rear driveway from the existing side gate to the rear garage. The proposed fence will have a masonry base and decorative cast iron panels between masonry pillars. It will be 6 feet tall.

FINDINGS:

a. This request was heard by the HDRC on January 15, 2014. At that hearing, the Commission referred the request to an onsite visit with the Design Review Committee.

b. The Design Review Committee met onsite to review this proposal on January 28, 2014. At that meeting, the applicant presented revisions to the original proposal, lowering the overall height by approximately 2 feet (to 14 feet) and lowering the height of the connector to one foot below the existing tiled parapet on the garage. The committee found that lowering the height helps reduce the impact of the structure. Similarly, it will not be highly visible at all from the public right-of-way. Staff still has concerns about the details of the proposed pavilion resembling too closely the details on the historic home and the committee noted that a more contemporary fenestration pattern already exists on a portion of the rear of the home.

c. The home and an accessory structure at 438 E. Rosewood appear on the 1924-1950 Sanborn map.

d. According to the Monte Vista Historic District survey, this home and the detached accessory building (listed as Maids Quarters in the survey) were designed by Robert B. Kelly and built in 1928 in the Spanish Eclectic style. Both structures were identified as contributing resources to the district.

e. The home at 438 E. Rosewood is considerably elevated from the street with dense landscaping at the street edge and closer to the structure. Currently there is a simple metal fence set behind the home at the driveway. Due to these conditions the proposed new pavilion and fencing will not be highly visible from the street.

f. The height of the main mass of the proposed pavilion has been lowered from the original proposal and will sit approximately 9" taller than that of the existing garage. According to the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, Section 1.B.v, the height of a new addition should be determined by the line-of-sight or visibility from the street. While the proposed pavilion is still slightly taller than the garage structure, staff finds that the reduced height will help to reduce its perceived scale. Similarly, the proposed pavilion will not be highly visible from the street, consistent with the guidelines.

g. The proposed new pavilion structure incorporates architectural details and materials that mimic those of the original home and garage in such a way that there is little distinction between the new structure and the historic structures, which is not consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation number 9.

h. The Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, Section 4.A.iii encourages the incorporation of contemporary interpretations of historic architectural details. Staff finds that the details of the proposed pavilion structure are too close in character and design to those on the original structures and should be simplified or modified to indicate that they are not historic structures.

- i. The revised proposal to lower the height of the proposed connector between the garage and the new pavilion will help differentiate the original structure from the new, consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation number 10. While a freestanding structure would be preferable to one that is attached to a historic building, staff finds that if a connection is necessary functionally, the height of the connector should drop below the roofline of the existing garage to help distinguish the original form of the garage from the new construction, consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Additions, Sections 1.A.iv and 1.B.i.
 - j. The proposed pavilion is 3'1" from the western property line and does not have an overhang on the west side, which is in compliance with current side yard setback requirements.
 - k. The proposed new fence will be in the rear yard and will not be highly visible from the public right-of-way, consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, Section 2.B.ii.
 - l. While the proposed new fence is of a different and more ornate design than the existing rear and side yard metal fencing, it is appropriate in terms of its height for placement in the rear yard and it will be partially screened from view by the existing fencing and landscaping.
1. Staff recommends approval with the stipulation that the architectural details be simplified based on findings g and h.
 2. Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings e, k and l.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve revised drawings submitted to HDRC on February 5, 2014.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Shafer, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

26. HDRC NO. 2014-019

Applicant: Lance Ligon, Terramark

Address: 405, 407, 409, and 411 Kendall St.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

Install front yard wrought iron fences around the front yards of the recently constructed Kendall Urban Bungalows. This development includes 4 detached houses with front walkways. The proposed fencing will be no more than 4 feet tall with simple pickets and decorative finials. Gates will be installed at each walkway.

FINDINGS:

- a. This request was heard by the HDRC on January 15, 2014. At that hearing, the Commission chose to postpone voting on the request until the applicant could be present to answer questions about the proposal.
- b. The Kendall Urban Bungalows are an infill project within the Tobin Hill Historic District that received final HDRC approval on February 6, 2013.
- c. While there are several examples of front yard fences on properties surrounding this development, most of those fences pre-date the creation of the Tobin Hill Historic District and are constructed of materials that would likely not be approved in a designated historic district.
- d. Due to the fact that this development covers a large portion of the 400 block of Kendall, the installation of new front yard fences on all four of these properties will result in a long length of fence in a district where front yard fences are not common overall.

e. This block of Kendall Street does not have a uniform street edge. The house directly to the south of this property faces Kendall Street, but the church across the street faces E. Myrtle Street to the south.

f. While staff finds that new front yard fencing is not appropriate for this location, the proposed simple wrought iron fencing is consistent in terms of height and materials with the Historic Design Guidelines for Site Elements, Section 2.B.

Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on findings c and d.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve as submitted.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Guarino, Shafer, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: Laffoon, Valenzuela

THE MOTION CARRIED.

27. HDRC NO. 2013-385

Applicant: Mike Hollaway

Address: 247 (formerly 241-1) E. Kings Hwy

Reset to February 19, 2014

28. HDRC NO. 2014-047

Applicant: Candid Rogers

Address: 224 Lavaca

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Construct a 5'-5" by 9'-2 ½" addition to the front of an existing non-historic addition that is located in the front of this property. The front addition will have a flat roof set lower than the structure it is attached to and be clad in copper metal panels;

2. Construct a 5'-5" by 12'-3 ½" addition to the front of an existing non-historic addition that is located entirely within the back yard of this property. The backyard addition will have be clad in cedar shiplap siding and will maintain the existing single-sloped pitch of the existing non-historic structure;

3. Install a 48", welded wire fence with metal posts along the back of the existing gravel parking area. The fence will tie into an existing front yard fence at this property; and

4. Expand the existing curb cut and concrete apron from 12 feet to 18 feet for increased access the existing gravel parking area.

FINDINGS:

a. The existing additions to the historic stone house at this property were approved by the HDRC in 2006. Currently, the addition that is visible from the front of the property features wood siding consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i. An alteration to this existing addition would not be inappropriate provided that the materials continue to be consistent with the guidelines.

b. The selected cladding materials for the front addition (copper panels) are not consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i. are not appropriate within the Lavaca Historic District. Materials that are compatible with those found in adjacent historic structures (wood, stucco and stone) would be more appropriate.

c. The proposed fenestrations on the front addition are similar to the existing openings that were approved by the HDRC in 2006. However, a fenestration pattern that references the shape and size of traditional window openings would be more consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 4.A.i.

d. The proposed backyard addition is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions in terms of scale, massing, form, materials and details.

e. The proposed section of fence will tie into an existing front yard fence on the property and is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B. in terms of design, location and height. It will not affect the overall streetscape or views to the historic stone structure.

f. The existing curb cuts and aprons on this block of Lavaca Street appear to be a later, non-historic public improvement to the area. There is a fairly consistent apron width of 9-10 feet with a 12 foot flare. Generally, driveways in historic districts are no wider than 10 feet. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 5.B.ii, the width of new curb cuts should be consistent with those found within the district. Although there is a nearby example of two adjacent driveways on separate properties combined for a wider curb cut, there is not a precedent for a single 18-foot curb cut as requested.

1. Staff recommends approval of the front addition with the stipulations that the materials and fenestrations are revised for consistency with the guidelines based on findings a through c.

2. Staff recommends approval of the backyard addition as submitted based on finding d.

3. Staff recommends approval of the fence as submitted based on finding e.

4. Staff does not recommend approval widening the curb cut based on finding f.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Guarino to approve revised drawings presented on 2/5/14 as submitted.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Shafer, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

29. HDRC NO. 2013-263

Applicant: William Maney

Address: 424 Lamar

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to construct a two-story, single family residence on the vacant lot at 424 Lamar. The proposed new construction would have a footprint of approximately 1,000 sf and a total square footage of approximately 2,100 sf. The design features a front-gabled standing seam metal roof, one-over-one vinyl windows and fixed windows, an inset front porch and rear balcony. Cladding materials consist of stucco and clapboard siding. Proposed site improvements consist of a concrete walkway, 9-foot decomposed granite driveway and a rear decomposed granite parking pad accessed from Fayn Way.

FINDINGS:

a. This request received conceptual approval from the HDRC on August 21, 2013, with the stipulation that the foundation be a raised foundation consistent with nearby historic properties and that the windows be wood-framed instead of vinyl based. The applicant, at the time of the hearing, agreed to both stipulations and has revised the design to incorporate a 16" raised foundation which will allow for front steps. However, the applicant is currently requesting to use vinyl windows in the current request for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

- b. The vacant lot at 424 Lamar is a deep lot measuring approximately 185 feet between Lamar and Fayn Way (alley). The footprint of the proposed new construction is well below the 50% building to lot ratio referenced in the Guidelines for New Construction 2.D.i. The proposed decomposed granite driveway and parking pad are appropriate within the Dignowity Hill Historic District and do not add impervious lot coverage.
- c. This block of Lamar remains intact with a high level of integrity. Several of the nearby historic homes are 2 stories tall. A two-story house would be appropriate for the block and consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.i.
- d. As submitted, the proposed front yard setback and building orientation are consistent with nearby historic properties. This conforms to the Guidelines for New Construction 1.A.
- e. As submitted, the proposed new construction consists of a slab on grade. A raised foundation with front steps would be more consistent with neighboring historic properties (which feature pier and beam foundations) and consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.A.iii.
- f. According to Guidelines for New Construction 2.C., new construction should feature a fenestration pattern that is consistent with those found in nearby historic properties. As submitted, a majority of the windows feature traditional sizes and configurations, consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines.
- g. The proposed materials of stucco and clap board represent materials commonly found in the Dignowity Hill Historic District and are consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.i.
- h. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.v., imitation or synthetic materials should be avoided in new construction. The proposed vinyl windows are not consistent with this guideline. Wood windows would be more appropriate.

Staff recommends approval with the stipulation that wood windows are used instead of vinyl based on finding h. If the HDRC approves vinyl windows, then staff recommends that the applicant consider installing wood screens to maintain a similar appearance as wood windows.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve with the stipulation that if vinyl windows are selected they be covered by a wood screen.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Shafer, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

30. HDRC NO. 2014-041

Applicant: Hausman Homebuyers, Inc. Lazar Hausman

Address: 326 Mission St.

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Restore 16 original wood windows at the house at 326 Mission Street to working order;
2. Replace a non-original front door "B", which was added as part of a duplex conversions, with a new wood window and screen to match an adjacent original window;
3. Relocate an existing side entry door "C" to the nearby, rear-facing portion of gabled extension;
4. Relocate an existing rear entry door "D" to another room at the rear of the house;
5. Repair and install new step and handrails at the side entry and two rear entries;
6. Reroof existing standing seam metal roof with new standing seam metal with matching ridge and seam details;
7. Remove the two existing brick chimneys;

8. Relocate two, original wood windows “8” and “10” from the side of the house to the rear. One of these will replace a non-original aluminum window on the rear of the house;
9. Replace siding on rear addition to match original siding found elsewhere on the house;
10. Replace and repair any missing or damaged wood windows screens; and
11. Historic Tax Certification

FINDINGS:

- a. During a site visit with the owner on January 13, 2014, staff confirmed that the existing original wood windows were in good condition and could be repaired. It is believed that these windows originally featured a two-over-two configuration. Some of the sashes have been repaired over time, and multiple light configurations have been introduced. The owner will maintain the existing light configurations where reasonable to do so, but in some cases the window may be returned to two-over-two. During the visit, staff also confirmed that the left front entry door was likely the original door to the house since it featured period construction details and aligned with the central hall on the interior of the house.
- b. The house at 326 Mission Street was constructed circa 1905 in the Folk Victorian style as a single-family residence. Although designated as a local historic landmark as Grundman House #2, its first listed resident is Mrs. Catherine Smith. City directories indicate that the house was converted to a duplex circa 1950. Despite this alteration, rear porch enclosure and rear addition, the house possesses good architectural integrity with many original elements remaining intact.
- c. Window repair is encouraged over replacement. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iii, historic windows should be preserved. When glass is broken, the color and clarity of replacement glass should match the original historic glass. The windows at 326 Missions Street have been repaired over time, and staff commends the applicant for restoring the windows to working order. Some of the windows were previously repaired with mismatched glass and light configurations. Every attempt should be made to match the original glass and light configuration in the current project.
- d. Staff finds that the right front entry door “B” requested for removal represents a later alteration to the house. The proposal to return this opening to a matching wood window will return the front façade to its likely original condition consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Alterations and Maintenance 6.B.
- e. While the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i generally discourages the filling in of original door openings, a priority is placed on preserving openings on the primary façade. It is unclear whether the side entry door “C” is original to the structure. It does not represent a significant entry element as it is lacking an original porch or stoop. Its relocation to the dining room would not greatly impact the overall integrity of the house or its appearance from the street.
- f. Door “D” is not believed to be an original entry as it is situated at the rear of an enclosed porch. Its relocation to the adjacent rear addition will not impact the overall integrity of the house.
- g. The existing standing seam metal roof is believed to be original. Replacing with in-kind materials is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 3.B. provided that the ridge and seam details are consistent with the Checklist for Metal Roofs. The applicant has agreed to install the roof with the appropriate specifications.
- h. The two extant chimneys, while no longer functional, are proposed to be removed by the applicant. The chimneys are presently believed to terminate in the attic space, likely a result of the duplex conversion. Assuming that the chimneys are structurally sound, staff finds that preserving them in place would be the most appropriate solution as they are a character-defining feature to the property.
- i. The Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.i generally discourage the filling in of original window openings. Windows “8” and “10”, although located towards the rear of the house, are believed to be in their original locations. The requested relocation of these windows to the rear of the house is necessitated by the proposed interior floor plan. Staff finds that the floor plan could be redesigned to accommodate the windows in their current locations and configurations.

j. Replacing non-original siding on the addition with a period-appropriate wood siding is consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 1. The addition will continue to be distinguishable as a non-original element, but will feature more appropriate materials.

k. The proposal to replace and repair any missing or damaged wood windows screens is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A.iv and 6.B.ix.

l. The applicant has met all the requirements for Historic Tax Certification outlined in UDC Section 35-618 and has provided evidence to that effect to the Historic Preservation Officer.

1-6. Staff recommends approval on findings a through g with the stipulation that each window being repaired be returned to the original light configuration or glass type where feasible.

7. Staff does not recommend approval of chimney removal at this time based on finding h.

8. Staff does not recommend approval of relocating windows "8" and "10" based on finding i.

9-11. Staff recommends approval as submitted based on finding j through l.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Judson to approve items 1-6 with staff recommendations. Denial of item 7 based on finding h. 8. Approval with the stipulations that windows are maintained in place. The non-original window may be removed and transoms added to allow for a bed wall. 9-11. Approved as submitted based on findings j through l.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Shafer, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

31. HDRC NO. 2014-048

Applicant: Irby Hightower

Address: 308 W. Summit Ave.

Postponed at the request of the applicant.

32. HDRC NO. 2014-032

Applicant: Regan Properties

Address: 258 Thorain

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Replace the existing metal windows with new metal windows that are 6 inches taller than the existing.

2. Remove the existing decorative metal columns and wood posts at the attached carport and replace them with two new brick columns. The proposed brick columns are 18"x18" square in plan and would be on either side of the carport at the edge closest to the front of the house.

FINDINGS:

a. The home at 258 Thorain appears on the 1924-1950 Sanborn map. At that time, no carport was indicated.

b. According to the Olmos Park Terrace survey, the existing carport was a later addition to the structure.

c. The applicant received administrative approval to replace the existing non-original metal windows in kind. The replacement windows that were installed were 6 inches taller than the existing, requiring the applicant to modify the wood trim above each window opening.

d. The existing windows maintain a dimension that respects the existing horizontal wood trim below the roofline. The proposed new windows will require modification to this element. Staff finds that the existing wood trim is a character defining feature of the home, establishing a clear horizontal datum at the upper edge of the brick walls. To change this would not be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation number 2 or with the Historic Design Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, Section 6.A.i.

e. The existing attached carport is not original to the home, based on historic maps.

f. Staff finds that the proposed modification to the existing pillars at the carport will not have an adverse effect on any historic materials. Similarly, the proposed brick columns will help simplify the appearance of the carport and tie it in with the rest of the brick house.

1. Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on findings c and d. Staff recommends that the windows be replaced with new metal windows of the same dimensions as the existing to maintain the existing opening.

2. Staff recommends approval as submitted based on findings a, b, e and f.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve staff recommendations based on findings a through f.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Shafer, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

33. HDRC NO. 2014-021

Applicant: Frank Telles

Address: 230 Callaghan

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

Construct a new 2,061 square foot, two story home on a vacant lot. The proposed structure will have vertical siding, stucco and stone veneer on the north (front) and east façades with horizontal hardi board on the west and south facades. The proposed home will have sloped roofs and parapet walls on the front and rear facades creating the appearance of a flat roof.

FINDINGS:

a. The property at 230 Callaghan is located in the Lavaca Historic District at the corner of Callaghan and Eager St. Currently the lot is vacant with a high perimeter fence covered with climbing plants. Directly to the west is an existing historic home. Across Eager St. to the east is another vacant corner lot. Across Callaghan to the north is a San Antonio Independent School District property addressed on Lavaca St.

b. In terms of its lot coverage and setback, the proposed new structure is consistent with the pattern established by nearby historic homes, consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, Section 2.D.i.

c. The proposed new residence includes multiple exterior materials, including stone and stucco veneer as well as Hardie board siding. The Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, Section 3.A encourages the use of materials that relate to and complement those on nearby historic structures and discourages the use of imitation or synthetic materials. Staff finds that Hardie board is not an appropriate material in this context and that wood siding would be more appropriate. The proposed use of stone and stucco, while both found within the Lavaca Historic District, are not the typical exterior materials

for homes in this area. Staff finds that a reduction in the number of exterior materials would be appropriate to help relate the proposed structure to existing surrounding structures.

d. While the proposed structure incorporates sloped roofs, the parapet walls create the appearance of a flat roof which is more typical of a commercial structure than residential and is not consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, Section 2.B.i.

e. The proposed structure will likely be taller than the surrounding historic homes, which are mainly single story. However, the immediate context is somewhat eroded due to the fact that an institutional property is directly across Callaghan Ave. from this site and there is a vacant lot directly to the east of this site.

f. The proposed fenestration on the front façade of the home is not consistent with traditional fenestration patterns. The proportion of window to wall space is higher than typically found on historic homes due to the proposed large openings. Staff finds that a more traditionally proportioned fenestration system would be more appropriate.

g. The façade configuration of the structure is more typical of a commercial building than residential and should maintain a human scale and a more traditional ratio of window to wall space, based on nearby historic residences and in keeping with the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, Section 2.C.

h. While the home incorporates a front porch which is consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, the porch is oriented toward the side of the property, rather than the front which is not in keeping with traditional design.

i. The proposed structure incorporates a primary entry door which faces the side of the lot rather than the front, which is not consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, Section 1.B.i, which encourages orienting primary entrances toward the primary street. A front-facing main entry would be more appropriate.

j. The west elevation, as submitted, has very few windows and, while it is not highly visible from the public right-of-way, is a flat, largely blank wall. This is not consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines for New Construction, Section 2.C.ii, which says to avoid blank walls.

Staff does not recommend approval as submitted based on findings c, d and f-j. Staff recommends that the roof form, fenestration pattern, façade configuration and entrance orientation be revised to be more consistent with the adopted design guidelines.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to refer to the DRC.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Shafer, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

34. HDRC NO. 2014-040

Applicant: Michael P. Stein

Address: 518 E. Park

Postponed at the request of the applicant.

35. HDRC NO. 2014-046

Applicant: Joy Lee

Address: 124 N. Main

Reset to February 19, 2014.

36. HDRC NO. 2014-034

Applicant: Gabriel Redondo

Address: 2051 W. Kings Hwy

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Construct a 9-foot, freestanding carport in the existing driveway at 2051 W Kings Hwy. The carport will have a footprint of 20' by 35'. The structure will be cedar to match a previously-approved pergola at this property and will have a corrugated metal roof; and

2. Install a 3-foot wrought iron fence along the perimeter of the carport to enclose the backyard.

FINDINGS:

a. This block of W Kings Hwy was added to the Monticello Park Historic District in 2010, and the house at 2051 W Kings Hwy has been substantially altered over time. An attached, non-contributing carport once existing at this location, but has since been removed.

b. The proposed carport and fencing would be located entirely behind the house over an existing paved driveway consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 2.B.ii. The carport would be visible from the street.

c. An original submittal by the applicant requested a metal carport with steel posts. The request has since been revised by the applicant to incorporate wood construction to match the recently-approved pergola on this property consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.iii.

d. As submitted, the carport has a footprint of 750sf. The house at this property has a footprint of approximately 1200 sf. There is concern that a carport of this size would overwhelm the property. According to the Guidelines for New Construction 5.A.ii, new outbuildings (including carports) should be no larger in plan than 40 percent of the principal historic structure footprint. As submitted, the carport footprint is approximately 60% of the main structure. A smaller carport would be more consistent with this guideline.

e. As submitted, the carport has a corrugated metal roof. Corrugated metal is generally not an appropriate material within historic districts and is not consistent with the Guidelines for New Construction 3.A.iii. Staff finds that standing seam or 5-V crimp metal is more consistent with the Guidelines and would be a more appropriate roofing material.

f. The requested backyard fence is consistent with the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B in terms of design, location and height.

1. Staff does not recommend approval at this time. A smaller carport should be considered by the applicant based on finding d. Alternate roofing materials should also be considered by the applicant based on finding e.

2. Staff recommends approval as submitted based on finding f.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve revised drawings submitted to HDRC on February 5, 2014.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Shafer, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

37. HDRC NO. 2014-050

Applicant: Jill Giles

Address: 602 Avenue A

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install a double-sided, externally-illuminated, freestanding sign along Avenue A. The sign would be 11 feet tall, measured from ground to top of graphics, and feature a signage area of approximately 28 square feet (both sides counted, including logo graphics).

FINDINGS:

- a. The requested sign is consistent with UDC Section 35-678 in terms of design, size, materials and lighting.
- b. According to UDC Section 35-678(e)(4), freestanding signs over 6 feet tall are not allowed. If the HDRC recommends approval of a sign taller than 6 feet, then a variance for the full requested height must be approved by the Board of Adjustment.

Staff recommends approval with the stipulation that the sign be no taller than 6 feet measured from ground to top of logo graphics (pig) based on finding b.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Guarino and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve as submitted.

AYES: Cone, Judson, Laffoon, Guarino, Valenzuela, Shafer, Feldman, Connor

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

- Executive Session: Consultation on attorney – client matters (real estate, litigation, contracts, personnel, and security matters) as well as the above mentioned agenda items may be discussed under Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code.
- Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:40 P.M.

APPROVED


Tim Cone
Chair